THE HON'BLE SHRI G.S. SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE G. BHAVANI PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2873 of 2006

Between:

Kadiyam Raju

….Petitioner

A N D

The Osmania University, represented by its Vice-Chancellor, University Campus, Hyderabad & others. …Respondents

Advocate for Petitioner: Sri M.A. Ashfaq Mohiuddin

Advocate for Respondents: Sri Deepak Bhattacharjee

February 20, 2006

ORDER

Per G.S. Singhvi, C.J.

This Writ Petition filed in the name of public interest litigation can appropriately be termed as publicity interest litigation and deserves to be dismissed at the threshold.

The petitioner claims to be a student of M.Phil and City Secretary of Akhila Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad, Hyderabad which is said to be a social organization protecting the interests of the student community. He has averred that despite the leakage of question paper of M.Com. III Semester Examination in Information Technology allegedly by respondent No.4-Prof. M. Sulochana, the management of Osmania University, Hyderabad (respondent No.1) has not taken adequate measures to protect the interests of the student community.

In the course of hearing, we enquired from the learned counsel whether his client had made any written representation to the Vice-Chancellor or any other competent functionary of the University to investigate the so-called leakage of question paper. To this, learned counsel for the petitioner could not give any reply. However, Sri Deepak Bhattacharjee, counsel representing the

University gave out that the Vice-Chancellor has constituted a committee to examine the alleged leakage of question paper and the report of the committee is awaited.

From the statement of the learned counsel representing the University, it is clear that the concerned authorities are alive to the issue of alleged leakage of question paper and the Vice-Chancellor has already taken steps to redeem the situation. Therefore, the petitioner's interdiction through the process of the Court cannot, but, be treated as unwarranted and wholly unjustified.

With the above observations, the writ petition is dismissed.

We would have dismissed the writ petition with costs, but refrain from doing so because the petitioner himself is a student of M.Phil course.

G.S. SINGHVI, CJ

G. BHAVANI PRASAD, J

February 20, 2006

CHV s/ svs